



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a priori why the division into species should not be applied to mankind. It is for anthropologists to decide whether the facts require it. I do not hesitate to say that if such a division can be used it enormously simplifies classification, and that this alone might be a sufficient reason for adopting it. Once we have abandoned the Linnæan dogma, "Species tot sunt quot diversas formas ab initio produxit Infinitum Ens," it is hard to see any philosophical justification for refusing to multiply species; there is nothing more and nothing less divine in the conception of species than in any other of the convenient processes of our thought. Sergi goes further than dividing into species, he now in this latest work feels himself obliged to admit *genera*. This is not for me at least a matter of cardinal importance. I do not forget that at least one great botanist of late years has advocated the abolition of *genera*; and I would regard the retention or abolition of the term as purely a matter of convenience. The degrees of distinction between different genera and between species and genus vary enormously as every naturalist knows, and there can be nothing preposterous in the suggestion that European, African and Asiatic man are as widely separated as some genera of plants and animals.

Proceeding then on a principle of classification which has the closest analogies in botany and zoology the author of "L'Uomo" divides mankind into five genera, of which two are extinct and three still exist. He names them in carefully chosen terminology:

Palæanthropus (including the several species of fossil man found in Europe).

Notanthropus (including all the species of African man).

Heoanthropus (Asiatic man).

Archæanthropus (including the two species of prehistoric man found in South America).

Hesperanthropus (the American Indian).

His book is devoted to the detailed description of each of these genera with their species, varieties and hybrids. Space forbids me to follow this treatment in detail, but I would recommend the reader carefully to study, among many other interesting points, the very original and somewhat audacious sections which deal with extinct man both in Europe and in South America.

D. RANDALL-MACIVER.

GENERAL

Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament. Translated and Edited by Robert William Rogers. xxii and 470 pp. Ills., index. Eaton & Mains, New York, 1912. \$4.50. 9 x 6.

This work comes to publication just forty years after Schrader's first edition of his comparison of the cuneiform inscriptions with various important passages of the Old Testament. Many of us yet recall the storm which burst about the head of the German Assyriologist, even such as perhaps refrained from the opinion that such work fell but little short of impiety and had the feeling that the foundations of the faith were shaken. How great a difference a few years have made, for this volume presents the largest possible instances whereby the temple libraries of the Euphrates valley have revealed a relation to the sacred books of the Jews which can be none other than that of source; yet this volume bears the imprint of publishers who stand almost as official in one of the largest of the evangelical churches. Prof. Rogers has rendered a double service in thus assembling all that is at present known upon this interesting theme. His translation gives a running narrative such as will wholly satisfy the general reader. The students of the cuneiform will find abundant material for their research in his careful transliteration of the original texts, a science in itself apart from the question of interpretation. The material covers the religious mythology of early Genesis and in a second period affords data whereby to elucidate the historical books when the Jews and the Babylonians were in conflict for the empire of western Asia. In the former we find the story of the creation and of the deluge, in the latter the campaigns of such familiar monarchs as Tiglath-pileser, Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. It simplifies the reading that Prof. Rogers in his translation has employed names made familiar through the Jewish scriptures. It would be difficult for the untrained to recognize the king who went out to grass under the designation of Na-bi-um-ku-dur-ri-u-su-ur.

WILLIAM CHURCHILL.